THE CONTRIBUTION OF DANIEL MADIGAN'S THEOLOGICAL INSIGHTS TO INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN INDONESIA

B. Christian Triyudo Prastowo

ABSTRACT

Interreligious dialogue has three interrelated dimensions: an interreligious dimension (mutual relationship), a dialogical dimension (effective communication), and a confessional dimension (deepening of faith and cooperation). This essay explores how Madigan's theological reflection on dialogue with Muslims fits within those dimensions. Through descriptive-analytical and reflective-dialectical approaches, this essay concludes that the three interrelated dimensions of interreligious dialogue explain the holistic view of Madigan's theological reflection. It is very useful for Christian-Muslim dialogue in Indonesian context. Two important contributions are the relevance of the dialogue of repentance and the approach of mutual hospitality in theological dialogue with Muslims. This is the *kenosis* Christians have to go through to resonate with the Word.

1. This elaboration of this article is originally taken from some of substantial parts of the author's MA Thesis at the Loyola School of Theology, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines, entitled "Three Interrelated Dimensions of Interreligious Dialogue in Daniel Madigan's Lenten Journey."

A. Introduction

Today's situation for dialogue with Muslims in Indonesia has become more challenging. In the past, Christians and Muslims could think and work together to reach national independence. In the present and future, we must respond collaboratively to face stumbling blocks of the nation and of peaceful co-existence among its citizens. What do we need? How can it be done effectively?

Learning from some documents of the Church on dialogue and the experience of Daniel Madigan, SJ, in dialogue with Muslims, this essay wants to explore how Madigan's reflection on dialogue with Muslims ("Lenten Journey") can fit within the dimensions of interreligious dialogue and can be applied for interreligious dialogue in Indonesia.

B. Three Interrelated Dimensions of Interreligious Dialogue

Dialogue plays an essential role in being Church. It has theological basis in the history of salvation. The Church is called to participate in and extend this dialogue in and with the world (cf. *Ecclesiam Suam* [*ES*] 71–72). In its dynamics, there are three interrelated dimensions involved: an interreligious dimension (relationship), a dialogical dimension (communication), and a confessional dimension (faith-cooperation).[2]

B.1. Interreligious Dimension

This dimension is to create a space for interreligious relationship. The basis is a pervasive love of God, the Father. He made each of us in His "image and likeness" (cf. Gen 1:26). He is the Father of all and created everything by the eternal Word. In Him "all things were created, in heaven and on earth, all things were created through Him and for Him. He is before all things, and in Him all

2. The terms, "interreligious dimension, dialogical dimension, and confessional dimension" originally come from Francis Clooney (See Francis X. Clooney, "Comparative Theology," in *The Oxford Handbook to Systematic Theology*, ed. John Webster, Kathryn Tanner, Iain Torrance [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 659–63). In this essay, the author will reflect on them more broadly with some insights from the documents of the Church and the reflection from other theologians, such as Michael L. Fitzgerald, Jacques Dupuis, and J. Dunne.

things hold together (Col 1:16–17)."[3] This contemplation leads to the realization that all the members of the human family are related as sons and daughters of God (cf. *Nostra Aetate* [*NA*] 1). Thus, such relationship between the members of human family is needed in the first step of interreligious relation.

Through that basis, we can draw some qualities and dispositions. *NA* exhorts the members of the Church should enter into dialogue "with prudence and charity" (*NA* 2). *Dialogue and Proclamation* (*DP*, 1991) puts it in first place as a balanced attitude (cf. *DP* 47). It means that in dialogue, we need to be open and receptive. Thus, to enter into dialogue, "We do not impose anything, we do not employ any subtle strategies for attracting believers; rather, we bear witness to what we believe and who we are with joy and simplicity."[4] So the attitude needed here is listening by heart. Here, then, we can express what *DP* says about the form of dialogue of life to live harmoniously, to share the joys and sorrows, as well as the human problems and preoccupations. The goal is mutual understanding. The main elements are service and witness of Christian life (charity, mercy, pardon, reconciliation, and peace) as the "initial act of evangelization" (cf. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* 21).[5]

B.2. Dialogical Dimension

This dimension is to communicate of faith effectively by "passing over" and "returning."[6] The basis is a love communicated through the Word made Flesh. In Him, God entered history, assuming human nature in order to redeem

3. Fitzgerald says, "It stresses the universality of God's love, both geographically and historically. It underlines a conviction that has grown since the Council, namely that the mercy of God cannot be confined." (Michael Fitzgerald, "What the Catholic Church Has Learnt from Interreligious Dialogue," March 16, 2006, https://ejournals.bc.edu/ ojs/ index.php/scjr/article/view/1375 [accessed November 19, 2018]).

4. Cf. *Evangelii Gaduium* (*EG*) 3, Pope Francis, WYD Address to Brazilian leaders, 2013, Address to *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 2013; Message for the 48th World Day of Social Communications, 2014.

5. Cassidy avers that interreligious dialogue begins with a dialogue of life that is directed towards a friendly co-existence that enriches the partners by living out the human and spiritual values of the respective religions (cf. Edward Idris Cassidy, *Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue* [New York, Paulist Press, 2005], 137).

6. "When you pass over to other lives," he writes, "and by way of other lives to other cultures and other religions, you come back again with new insight into your own life, and by way of your own life to your own culture and your own religion" (J. Dunne, *The Way of All the Earth: An Invitation to Cross Over to the Great Eastern Religions and to Come Back to One's Own Tradition with New Insight* [New York and London: Macmillan Co., 1972], 220).

it from within. It is in Jesus that everything has been reconciled (cf. *Gaudium et Spes* [*GS*] 22, *Dialogue in Truth and Charity* 18). This conviction, which could be termed a mystical vision of the unity of the whole of humankind in Christ, gives an added dimension to the dignity of the human person. It enhances the duty of respect and dialogue with all. "The sincerity of interreligious dialogue requires that each enters into it with the integrity of his or her own faith" (*DP* 48).

If dialogue supposes the integrity of personal faith, it requires that each partner in the dialogue must enter into the experience of the other, striving to grasp that experience from within. In order to do that, we need to share two different religious faiths, making each of them one's own, and living both at once in one's own religious life.[7] So standing within our faith and openness means to plunge deeper into the deep mystery that God wants to show through other believers. From the forms of dialogue, this is the way of theological exchange in which we are to appreciate the spiritual values of each, to promote communion and fellowship among people and to deepen understanding of those religious heritages represented in conversation (cf. *Dialogue and Mission* [*DM*] 33, *NA* 1). The goal is not to achieve the unifying of our system of belief but mutual enrichment. This is a dialectical relationship with proclamation (in the broader sense).

B.3. Confessional Dimension

After we encounter the others, understand them internally and learn from them, the next step is to deepen our own faith and to respond together what God calls in the reality of the world (cf. *DP* 40). The basis of this dimension is a love made present through the work of the Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit himself, at work in the heart of every person, who guides the Church to recognize his presence and action in the world even beyond her visible boundaries (cf. *Redemptoris Missio* [*RM*] 28–29). So the Spirit helps to recognize the signs and the effects of Christ's action which are described in various Church's documents as "true and good things" (*Optatam Totius* 16), "precious religious and human things" (*GS* 92), "seeds of contemplation" (*Ad Gentes* [*AG*] 18), "elements of truth and grace" (*AG* 9), "seeds of the Word" (*AG* 11, 15), and "rays of truth

7. See. Jacques Dupuis, *Christianity and the Religions: From Confrontation to Dialogue*, trans. Phillip Berryman (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001), 230.

that illuminate all people" (*NA* 2, *DM* 26). Here the activity of the Holy Spirit is underlined and religious freedom is one of such objective conditions.[8]

It is obvious that there is an impact on the practice of interreligious dialogue, "The Christian is not going into this dialogue as someone who has everything meeting another who has nothing. Rather the Spirit in the Christian is able to meet the Spirit already present in the interlocutor belonging to another religious tradition. In the words of Cardinal Newman's motto*: cor ad cor loquitur* (heart speaks to heart)."[9] Also, it seems that interreligious dialogue has helped the Church to be more aware of the activity of the Spirit and to let herself be possessed by it (cf. *NA* 2).

One can, in all certainty, say that through dialogue, Christian and others "walk together towards truth and work together in projects of common concern" (*DM* 13).[10] In this way, then there is a reciprocity as goal. Through dialogue, we can deepen in our life of prayer, contemplation, and it becomes a spirit for the real action for the common concern.

C. Three Interrelated Dimensions of Interreligious Dialogue in the "Lenten Journey"

The historical accounts of the encounters between Muslims and Christians show that both came to dialogue with suspicion or prejudice. Vatican II then brought a new drive for this relationship by acknowledging some aspects in Muslim's faith and encouraging us to forget the past hostilities for the sake of future cooperation. The development of this relationships shows that we are not doing theology in isolation. Daniel Madigan[11] points out how it works. He calls it, "A Lenten Journey."[12]

---

8. There has surely been a growth in Pneumatology, the theology of the Spirit, since Vatican II, signalled by the encyclicals of John Paul II, *Dominum et Vivificantem* and *Redemptoris Missio.*

9. Fitzgerald, "What the Catholic Church Has Learnt from Interreligious Dialogue," March 16, 2006 https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/scjr/article/view/1375 (accessed November 19, 2018).

10. Dupuis, *Christianity and the Religions,* 233.

11. Daniel Madigan, SJ, is an Australian Jesuit priest who joined Georgetown's Department of Theology in 2008 and is teaching in the doctoral program on Religious Pluralism as well as in the undergraduate program. He holds the title of Jeanette J. and Otto J. Ruesch Family Distinguished Jesuit Scholar. In 2007–2008 he was International Visiting Fellow at the Woodstock Theological Center at Georgetown, and he continues there as a Research Fellow, directing a project on Christian theologies that are responsive to Islam. Before moving to Georgetown, he taught in Rome (2000–2007), where he was the founder and director (2002–

C.1. Interreligious Dimension in the "Lenten Journey"

As mentioned earlier in the interreligious dimension, human fraternity is needed as the first step of interreligious dialogue. The important elements in the relationship are to recognize the inherent dignity by listening of heart, to share joys and sorrows. "How does Daniel A. Madigan discuss the important elements in interreligious dialogue to build a deeper relationship with Muslims?"

C.1.1. Constructing a First-Person Plural (Our "We")

In his article, "Muslim-Christian Dialogue in Difficult Times," Madigan wrote that the first task in dialogue with Muslims is to construct our "we" (a new first-person plural).[13] This new "we" is built only gradually and with sustained commitment. It does not mean that we need to build the universal religion, but a world of civilization in dialogue (a condition of a preparedness to question and to be questioned). This is what the documents of Vatican II (e.g., *GS* and *NA*) emphasize about "universal fraternity or brotherhood." How can we construct the new "we" (universal fraternity)? Since Madigan also considers that sometimes the complex problem is more in intra-civilizational conflicts, to build a deep relationship, he proposes a dialogue of repentance in beginning of any kind of dialogue with Muslims. Once again, this is a condition to build, not an aim.

C.1.2. Dialogue of Repentance

Many can talk about love as what we have in common. It is very right. Madigan, however, observes that there is a big temptation to talk only about ideal things. It can be very superficial. If we are honest, we recognize that "Our

---

2007) of the Institute for the Study of Religions and Cultures at the Pontifical Gregorian University. He is a Consultor of the Vatican's Commission for Religious Relations with Muslims. His main fields of teaching and research are Qur'anic Studies, Interreligious Dialogue (particularly Muslim-Christian relations), and Comparative Theology. See https://jesuits.georgetown.edu/members/madigan (accessed June 10, 2020).

12. "Lenten" comes from the Old English word, "to lengthen." At least in the Northern Hemisphere, where it all began, the Lenten fast is a spring-time event. The short, bleak winter days are lengthening towards the equinox and brilliant summer. So Lenten Journey is a time of gradual expansiveness and fuller life. Cf. Daniel A. Madigan, "A Lenten Journey," in *Christian Lives Given to the Study of Islam*, ed. Christian W. Troll and C. T. R. Hewer [New York: Fordham University Press, 2012]," 250.

13. Cf. Daniel A. Madigan, "Muslim-Christian Dialogue in Difficult Times." *Encounter at Mar Musa: Documentation of Jesuits among Muslims in Mar Musa Monastery*, Nebek, Syria (3–10 September 2006): 34–46.

lives as individuals and as religious communities are more clearly marked by failure to observe the ideal of love than by success in achieving it." If something happens, "We more easily see others' failures than our own, and we tend to distance ourselves from those failures for which we are not personally and directly culpable."[14] Because of this tendency, he proposes that to begin the dialogue, we need to acknowledge our failures and open our heart to listen to what God wants to say (cf. Mt 7:3–5), namely dialogue of repentance. In Ignatian Spirituality, it is a kind of examination of consciousness.

Dialogue of repentance can be a new way to come to the truth that God indeed loved us first, and together with the other, we share honestly that we (as listeners of the Word) also have many failures to respond to God's love in the life-action. "We live in a world of various pathologies, but we delude ourselves if we think it is only "those other people" who have them, and that the way to resolve our ills is by denigrating the others or even getting rid of them. Our pathologies interrelate."[15] So reflecting on shared failures can help us to build the deeper relationship. Indeed, it needs humility that involves not only our mind but most importantly, our heart.[16]

C.1.3. Listening by Heart

The key in dialogue is an honest encounter based on a realistic self-image (cf. *DP* 48, *DTC* 42). Nevertheless, there is always a gap between the ideals we profess and the reality we manage to live. Many attempts at Muslim-Christian dialogue flounder at precisely this point: each partner has a strong tendency to

14. Daniel Madigan, "Our Next Word in Common: Mea Culpa?," in *The Future of Interfaith Dialogue: Muslim-Christian Encounters through A Common Word*, ed. Y. Said and L. Demiri (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 189.

15. Daniel Madigan, "Muslims and Christians: Where Do We Stand?" *Woodstock Report* (March 2009): 5.

16. Recently, Pope Francis and the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar on February 4, 2019 signed the Document on "Human Fraternity for World Peace and Living Together." The most interesting point is that document emphasizes that God has created all human beings equal in rights, duties, and dignity to fill the earth and make known the values of goodness, love, and peace. Then the document reminds us about the situation that sometimes we forget to respond: an innocent human life, the poor, destitute, marginalized, orphans, widows, refugees, the peoples who have lost their security, peace. In the end, the document exhorts about human fraternity that embraces all human beings, unites them and renders them equal. So the document invites us (Christians and Muslims) to see deeply the reality of the human race and our shared failures to respond to it in the light of God's love. See. https://zenit.org/articles/abu-dhabi-historic-document-signed-by-pope-francis-and-grand-imam-of-al-azhar/ (accessed February 13, 2019).

compare his own ideals with the reality of the other. The result is that each assumes a moral high ground and with a sense of superiority looks down on the other. It is a "dialogue of the deaf."

In one of his articles, Madigan reminds us about Paul VI's map of the Church in dialogue.[17] Paul VI in *ES* said, "Before speaking, it is necessary to listen, not only to a man's voice, but to the heart (*ES* 87)." Even if we are not listened to, we continue to listen with infinite patience. *Cor ad cor loquitur* (heart speaks to heart), said Cardinal Newman. Accordingly, the first key insight is to listen attentively, not merely to the words, but more importantly to the heart. The second is to recognize the motivation and same attentiveness as a believer who is trying to understand what God wants in human history,[18] "The awareness of hidden power or supreme being in a way of life of the believers (*GS* 86 and *NA* 2)." By listening attentively and recognizing the same attentiveness, we (Christians and Muslims) can build together "a world of civilization" in dialogue.

In sum, for the first step of dialogue with Muslims, Madigan underlines that in each country, there are many particular issues (e.g., many children who die of hunger and of common diseases, the nations crushed by indebtedness and corruption, the cultures brutalized by the globalization of greed, etc.). To construct our "we" means that Christians and Muslims need to reflect on our ignorance to many cases in responding to the love from God. Listening attentively is the key. It involves a sharing of deepest convictions in a sincere, respectful way that can be mutually enriching and renewing (cf. *EG* 251, 29, 142). By doing this, one is recognizing in the interlocutor the same attentiveness to what God is trying to show, not only by means of our scriptures and traditions, but also through creation and the events of human history. That is what the Qur'ān would call *aya,* "the sign of God."

17. Daniel Madigan, "Pope Paul VI's 'Map' of the Church in Dialogue: Are We Still Following It?," in *Le Dialogue Possible: Paul VI et les Cultures Contemporaines*, ed. G. Archetti (Brescia: Istituto Paolo VI, 2007), 29–34. Full article in https://www.assau.org/co-organise-par-la-mission-du (accessed February 15, 2019).

18. Cf. Madigan, "Pope Paul VI's 'Map,'" 32. In dialogue, we need to recognize the emotions and motivations lying behind the words which usually are generated by the poverty, the experience of exclusion, the sense of frustrated hope and the simple humiliation which is the lot of so many Muslims, because they live principally in the Third World.

C.2. Dialogical Dimension in the "Lenten Journey"

As mentioned earlier in the dialogical dimension, by passing over and returning, the mutual understanding can be reached. Mutual understanding is not agreement, but rather the way to make sure that each has understood the other's concerns (cf. *DM* 33). So, "how does Madigan recognize thoroughly the Muslims' basis of faith, so that it can be dialogued together?"

C.2.1. "Be a Good Host and a Good Guest" in Mutual Theological Hospitality

To enter specifically into the theological dialogue with Muslims, Madigan portrays "mutual theological hospitality" as a possible approach. This approach is similar to some Christian writers prior to Vatican II (e.g., Timothy the Patriarch [ca. 728–823], Nicholas of Cusa [1401–1464], Charles de Foucauld [1858–1916], Louis Massignon [1883–1962]).[19] In this approach, Madigan coins the image of "a good host" and "a good guest"[20] as the "door-way."

"Be a good host" means that we gradually start to take more notice of our guests, learn to speak their theological language (cf. *ES* 87), accommodate their questions and even let them to enter our "theological kitchen." Exactly, it needs epistemological humility (knowing the limits of human understanding and the impossibility of ever fully expressing the truth about God). "Be a good guest" explains that we are not proprietors of the truth. Together, we search for the meaning of the Word in the world. It needs the moral humility (recognizing our history of failure to live up to the Gospel we preach).[21] The purpose is a mutual opening to question and to be questioned.

---

19. The longer presentation can be seen in J. M. Gaudeul, *Encounters and Clashes: Islam and Christianity in History,* vol. 1, *A Survey;* vol. 2, *Texts* (Rome: Pontificio Instituto di Studi Arabi e d'Islamistica, 1990); Michael L. Fitzgerald, "History of the Christian-Muslim Relationship," in *Sign of Dialogue: Christians Encounters with Muslims,* ed. Michael L. Fitzgerald and R. Caspar (Zamboanga City: Silsilah Publications, 1992), 1–41; Robert Caspar, *A Historical Introduction to Islamic Theology* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Studi Arabi e d'Islamistica, 1998), 89–109; Hugh Goddard, *Christians and Muslims: From Double Standards to Mutual Understanding* (Surrey: Curzon Press, 1995).

20. Daniel Madigan, "Mutual Theological Hospitality: Doing Theology in the Presence of the Other," in *Muslim & Christian Understanding: Theory and Application of "A Common Word",* ed. Waleed El-Ansary and David K. Linnan, 57–68 (New York: Palgrave, 2010), 59.

21. Daniel Madigan, "Saving *Dominus Iesus*," in *Learned Ignorance: An Investigation into Humility in Interreligious Dialogue among Christians, Muslims and Jews,* ed. James Heft, Reuven Firestone and Omid Safi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 260. He draws the humility in two

In other words, hospitality is at its best when both host and guest are sensitive enough to one another to be able to share the same space with delight. How do we exercise mutual theological hospitality in the discourse about doctrinal matters?

C.2.2. "The Word" as Hermeneutical Key

Theological dialogue can only become productive if all partners involved understand the "language" that is used and explore together. Madigan suggests that the "Word of God" is a hermeneutical key in speaking with Muslims.[22] The emphasis is that Christians and Muslims believe the divine Word to have been addressed to us in the concreteness of our history.[23] In Madigan's book, *The Qur'ān's Self-Image: Writing and Authority in Islam's Scripture* (2001), he observes the semantic fields associated with the Qur'ān's self-image.[24] From his observation, he sees that what the Muslims grapple with in the field of *Kalām* (the Islamic speculative theology) to understand the Qur'ān as "Inlibrated Speech of God"[25] is not so far from what Christians understand Jesus Christ as "Incarnated Word of God." In other words, the correct parallel to understand

---

senses (epistemological and moral humility) from Catherine Cornille. See Catherine Cornille, *The Im-Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2008).

22. Madigan, "Lenten Journey," 253. The Word as a key point actually is not a new one in the dialogue with Muslims. In the oriental Christian tradition, some Muslim and Christian writers (ca. 9th century) already used this as the key concept in discussions and disputations. Yet, the problem was that they used it defensively. See in David Thomas, *Early Muslim Polemic against Christianity: Abu Isa al-Warraq's Against the Incarnation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 37–59.

23. We both experience the Word as being given "from above" and yet at the same time as having a resonance with what has already been expressed by God in creation and in the divine activity in history. Neither Christians nor Muslims believe that what we are doing in our profession of faith is elevating without any justification a merely human Word to a divine status it has no right to occupy. Rather we both perceive that Word as having been sent down to us (as witness the many Qur'ānic uses of the verb *nazzala* "send down" and in John's Gospel the uses of *pempō* "to send" and *katabainō* "to come down"). See Daniel A. Madigan, "Christian-Muslim Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue,* ed. Catherine Cornille (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 253.

24. Detailed analysis is in Daniel Madigan, *The Quran's Self-Image: Writing and Authority in Islam's Scripture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

25. What Muslims have long grappled with is to understand: (1) The relationship between God's self and God's speech; (2) The relationship between God's speech and the pre-existent Qur'ān, relationship between the Pre-existent Qur'ān to the actual Qur'ān when it was first revealed (the speech of God); (3) The relationship between the speech of God and the continuation in the world (when it is written down and recited).

"the Word" is in the nature of the Word, in Christianity (that is Christ) and in Islam (that is the Qur'ān).[26]

In this correct parallel (Jesus Christ and al-Qur'ān), we are both in a position of having to respond to the series of questions and paradoxes that arise from our shared basic affirmation that the eternal and transcendent God has spoken a word – God's own Word – in and to our world. Madigan, then, picks up the thread of revelation and God's communication with and in the world. He draws attention to the fact that the communication of God to people must be in a "human language."[27] This is a shared perspective and common belief in both traditions. From that, Madigan, then argues that the "language" of God's communication can be Arabic words or "body language" as manifested in incarnation. The core meaning is the same, that is, God communicates and shares His will to all humanity.

The focus is on recognition of "the presence and expression of the eternal, universal, divine Word in something, that to someone who does not believe, is merely human – in the case of Christians, in a first-century carpenter from Nazareth; in the case of Muslims, in a seventh-century Arabic text."[28] This focus gives rise to a number of overlapping theological issues related to (1) the relationship between God's self and God's Word, the eternity of the Word, and (2) the relationship between the Divine and historically-conditioned aspects of the Word. Through this parallel, Christians can also explain to Muslims about the divinity of Christ and incarnation, without compromising them.

---

26. From the Muslim side, Seyyed H. Nasr also recognized the same things. He said, "The word of God in Islam is the Qur'ān, in Christianity it is Christ" (Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Ideals and Realities of Islam* [London: George Allen & Unwin, 1996; 2d ed. Unwin Paperbacks, 1979], 43).

27. Madigan, "Particularity, Universality, and Finality," 19; Madigan, "People of the Word: Reading John with a Muslim,": 81; Madigan, "Mutual Theological Hospitality," 9. Reza Shah- Kazemi also draws a connection between the *Logos*, as depicted in the Gospel of John, and the Qur'ān (Reza Shah- Kazemi, "Light upon Light? The Qur'ān and the Gospel of John," in *Interreligious Hermeneutics*, ed. Catherine Cornille and Christopher Conway, Interreligious Dialogue Series 2 [Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010], 123–25).

28. Daniel Madigan, "Particularity, Universality and Finality: Insights from the Gospel of John." In *Communicating the Word*, ed. David Marshall (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2011), 19; Madigan, "Muslim-Christian Dialogue," 58.

C.2.3. Mutual Understanding

Through the correct parallel, Madigan explores two points to enrich the faith of both: First, how for Christians an understanding of the Muslim estimation of the Qur'ān and the role of Muhammad can be enriched by an appreciation of the parallels. Second, how the correct parallels give Muslims a better understanding of the Scriptures and of Trinity.

In relation to the first point (for Christians), Madigan explains that: (a) The notion of sacramentality can explain a good deal about how the Qur'ān functions in the life of the Muslims.[29] The recitation of the Arabic is a re-presentation, a making present once again of the original event of revelation. In making those sounds, the reciter is entering into the primordial moment of encounter between God and the Prophet. In this sense, the recited Qur'ān bears for the Muslim some of the significance that the Eucharist holds for the Christian ("Do this in the memory of Me"). This aspect of "sacramentality," then, explains why a translation is not considered to be the Qur'ān, since it is the point of entry into the divine reality. This also happens to Christians who do not change the bread and wine in the Eucharist into more culturally forms, because we wish to enter into the historical action of Jesus himself.

(b) The role of Mary can explain the role of Muhammad as bearer of the Word. For Muslims, Muhammad is not an author of the Qur'ān. The parallel figure in the Christian part of the schema is Mary. Muhammad and Mary are bearers of the Word to a world that is not always ready or willing to receive it. The most obvious is the parallelism of the doctrines of the virginity of Mary and the illiteracy of Muhammad (*al-nabiyy-al-ummiyy*). Seyyed Nasr said,

> The prophet must be unlettered for the same reason that the Virgin Mary must be virgin. The human vehicle of a divine message must be pure and untainted. The divine Word can only be written on the pure and "untouched" tablet of human receptivity. If this Word is in the form of flesh, the purity is symbolized by the virginity of the mother who gives birth to the Word, and if it is in the form of a

29. The explanation about the notion of sacramentality below is the summary from Madigan's article. See. Daniel Madigan, "Mary and Muhammad: Bearers of the Word," *Australasian Catholic Record 80* (2003): 419–25.

> book, this purity is symbolized by the unlettered nature of the person who is chosen to announce this word among men.[30]

So the virginity of Mary or illiteracy of Muhammad is concerned with the divine origin and intervention in relation to the mystery of the incarnation or inlibration in Islamic tradition. In both cases, the method God has chosen to make the Word present in the world requires human cooperation: in one case to give the Word flesh, in the other to give it voice. Yet that human cooperation must not be allowed somehow to compromise the integrity of the Word itself. Both (Mary and Muhammad) in their respective traditions are seen as indispensable to the process of the Word's entering the world and yet they are also in a way strangely distanced from it.[31] It should be added that the parallel with Mary does not exhaust the roles played by the figure of Muhammad. He is in another sense parallel to Moses in that he is presented as a lawgiver and leader who brought his people out of persecution to a new land and a new identity. He also plays roles analogous to those of Paul and Constantine in Christianity. He is the uniquely authoritative interpreter of the revelatory event; he unites political and military power in the service of a religious end.[32] By understanding this parallel, Christians may come to understand better how Muslims see the Qur'ān and the role of Muhammad for Muslim faith in relation to the inlibrated Qur'ān.[33]

In relation to the second point (for Muslims), Madigan explicates[34]: (a) For Christians, Jesus is the message rather than the messenger. It is related to the question of the relationship of the scriptures to the Word. The scriptures are not the Word itself, but rather witnesses to the Word (cf. Lk 1:1–4; Heb 1:1–3).

30. Nasr, *Ideals and Realities of Islam,* 43–44.

31. Cf. Daniel Madigan, "God's Word to the World: Jesus and the Qur'ān, Incarnation and Recitation," in *Godhead here in Hiding: Incarnation and the History of Human Suffering*, ed. Terence Merrigan and Frederik Glorieux (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 168.

32. Madigan, "Mary and Muhammad," 423.

33. Christian responses to Muslim images of Muhammad tend to confound these categories and presume that Muhammad is being proposed as a replacement saviour. Yet that is not what Muslims generally believe of him. Similarly, Muslim responses to Christian faith in Jesus often miss the parallel with their faith in the Qur'ān. For Muslims the Qur'ān comes as a Word not to be interrogated but to be received and obeyed (Daniel Madigan, "Jesus and Muhammad: the Sufficiency of Prophecy," in *Bearing the Word: Prophecy in Biblical and Qu'ranic Perspective,* ed. Michael Ipgrave [London: Church House Publishing, 2005], 95).

34. Summary from Madigan, "Mary and Muhammad," *Australasian Catholic Record 80* (2003): 425–27.

Thus, it is of the utmost importance in Muslim-Christian relations to understand the different estimations of scripture in our respective traditions. "Scripture is not a common term between us. Rather it is the hinge on which most of our misunderstandings turn."[35] The common term that can open the way to mutual understanding is God's Word or Speech.

(b) Since Muslims discussed at length what might be the precise relationship between the "original" Qur'ān, the Qur'ān as revealed, and the Qur'ān as it is re-recited, this correct parallel can give a better chance also of understanding some of the key facets of Trinity. If one believes in one God and then one perceives that that very God who is so utterly beyond us has also addressed us in a way intelligible to us. One is then forced to ask about the relationship between God and God's speech. When we have experienced God's speech in our world, we end professing that there are, in a sense, two aspects of this one God. In one sense, God is completely self-sufficient and in other sense, as one who is inherently and eternally communicating. God is not just other, but God-for-the-other, God-addressing the other in history.

Still, we have a further experience that must somehow be accounted for in our doctrine of God. The event of the Word-in-the-world is in some sense historically bound and determined: the Christ ascends to heaven; the Qur'ānic revelation ceased with the death of the prophet. And yet there is a certainty on the part of each believing community that that initial moment, in some sense normative and definitive, is still working itself out.[36] The Muslim community lives with the confidence that the guidance of God continues even beyond the matters made explicit in the text of the Qur'ān. God remains active within the community of the prophet, leading it to the fullness of the truth, through the prophet and through those who study his example in order to discover, as time goes on, the fullness of the meaning contained in the Qur'ān. The Christian community discovered that God remained active within it to guide and animate the community. This is a third aspect of the divine. God is not only beyond us (Father) but also with us in the Word-in-the-World (Son), and furthermore continually active within and among us as Spirit (Holy Spirit). It is the doctrine of the Trinity that might be seen to have echoes in Muslim faith and experience, because it is at base an affirmation and even a radicalization of monotheism rather than a watering-down of it.

35. Madigan, "Mary and Muhammad," 426.

36. Cf. Ibid., 427.

C.3. Confessional Dimension in the "Lenten Journey"

As mentioned earlier, the basis for this dimension is "a love made present through the work of the Spirit." Since the Holy Spirit guides us to respond to the love of God in the world, we need to walk together towards the truth and work for the common concern. The goal is mutual reciprocity and enrichment. "How does Madigan show that by exercising mutual theological hospitality, instead of neglecting our own faith or doing relativism, we still can confess our faith?"

C.3.1. Relational Theology

For him, doing relational theology is not an effort of relativism which would suggest that Muslims and Christians have different truths and that is fine, rather recognizes that being in search of the one truth means also being in relation to those other seekers of the truth who do not believe as we do. The challenge is to understand that Christians are doing it in the presence of people who believe differently and we are doing it together to make some progress in finding new expressions of Christian faith that are accessible to Muslims while still being faithful to the Christian tradition.

In some articles, he explores the Gospel of John together with Muslims. Through the exploration about the Word in the Gospel of John, Christians can express our faith in Jesus (divine-incarnation-holy spirit) to Muslims. If we were to apply it to Muslim discourse about the Qur'ān, it is traditionally high-descending: the Qur'ān is God's eternal Word (divine) that comes down (inlibrated) and gives a power when it is recited. Madigan asserts, "A satisfactory Logos-Christology gives us a first opening into a more accessible theology of the Trinity, because Muslim theology has already settled on an expression about God's Speech (*kalām Allāh*) to the effect that it is an essential attribute of God, which although it is not simply identical with God, is nothing other than divine. In the classic Arabic formulation, it is *ṣifah dhātiyyah lā 'aynuhu wa-lā ghayruh*. That is a paradox which is almost identical to the one John leaves us with in the very first verse of his Gospel."[37]

C.3.2. Self-Emptying Love as Particularity

Beyond those similarities, he also shows about Christian particularity: the mystery of the Cross. This is the point for deepening of the Christian faith. The

37. Madigan, "Mutual Theological Hospitality," 63.

centrality of the cross points out the real meaning of the self-emptying love. God chooses frail flesh to express to humans that vulnerable love God has for us. In the resurrection of Jesus, God is affirming the truth not only about divinity but also about humanity. Self-sacrificing love is revealed as ultimately the way to true life. In living out the same sacrificial love as Jesus did, we, too, share in his rising to life. Here actually there is a challenge.

If Christians really want to enter to the particularity, the consequence is "the correct attitude of a believer before what she or he considers to be God's definitive Word is not one of pride in the possession of this revelation, rather humility before it. The truth of God will possess us, and not *vice versa*. We are servants of that Word and that Truth, not its masters or owners."[38] In this sense, "Christians are not salespeople for the Reign of God, but free samples of it."[39] By self-sacrificial love, we are making some progress in finding new expressions of Christian faith in real life. Here, he is pointing out the way of self-sacrificial love: doing justice, caring for the poor, marginalized, being humble, taking initiative in dialogue with two senses of humility. This is our role as believers who resonate with Word in the world.

In sum, theological dialogue is essential. Nevertheless, what Madigan explains about theological dialogue has to do with the relation that realizes the condition of our shared failures to respond to the love and discerns afterward. By doing that, the theological exchange can be fruitful. The fruit is not only that we understand the other's concerns, but we can deepen our own faith (self-sacrificial love, *kenosis*).

D. Contributions of Madigan's Thought for the Indonesian Context

There are two important insights in relation to the condition of Indonesia. First, constructing our "we" by dialogue of repentance. Second, entering the theological dialogue with mutual hospitality.

38. Daniel Madigan, "The Gospel of John as a Structure for Muslim-Christian Understanding," in *Reading the Bible in Islamic Context –Qur'ānic Conversations*, ed. Daniel J. Crowther, Shirin Shafaie, Ida Glaser, and Shabbir Akhtar (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), 266.

39. Madigan, "The Gospel of John as Structure," 267.

D.1. Constructing Our "We" in the Context of Indonesia

Compared to many other countries, the social atmosphere of Indonesia seems to be more favorable to construct our "we." First, most Indonesian Christians live surrounded by Muslims who represent "Islam with a smiling face."[40] This is a favorable condition for encountering them. At the grassroots level, most people of different faiths in Indonesia have no difficulty to live harmoniously.[41] Second, despite its Muslim majority, Indonesia does not constitute an Islamic state based on Islamic law. Pancasila becomes a platform to build the nation with *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (unity in diversity) as a national motto. It is truly a grace and therefore, socially and politically, it can be a good foundation to build our "we."

Yet, it does not mean that there is no difficulty at all to construct our "we." Today's situation is more challenging. If in the past, Christians and Muslims could work together to reach national independence, in the present and future, we have to respond collaboratively to face the stumbling blocks of the nation and of peaceful co-existence among its citizens.[42] Today, some extremists assert themselves more clearly through non-violent action (seminars, demonstrations, socialization, etc.) or violent action (raid attacks to night-clubs, anti-apostasy movements, paramilitary attacks in conflict, suicide bombings, etc.), they enter all lines of life softly through education and they use social media to threaten many people.[43] No wonder that many incidents in

40. The label "Islam with a Smiling Face" was used by international magazines such as *Time* and *Newsweek* in September 1996 to describe the form of Islam in Indonesia: inclusive, progressive, and modern. See Azyumardi Azra, "Distinguishing Indonesian Islam," in *Islam in Indonesia,* ed. Jajat Burhanudin and Kees van Dijk (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), 63–75, and Martin van Bruinessen, "What happened to the Smiling Face of Indonesian Islam?," Working paper (2011), 1–45, available in https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/234518 (accessed January 8, 2019).

41. Cf. Achmad Munjid, "Building a Shared Home for Everyone: Interreligious Dialogue at the Grass Roots in Indonesia," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 43/2 (2008): 109–20; Siti Sarah Muwahidah, "Interfaith Dialogue at the Grassroots Level: A Case Study of an Interfaith Empowerment Program in East Java, Indonesia," *Political Theology Journal* 9, no. 1 (2008): 79–92; J. B. Banawiratma and Zainal Abidin Bagir, et al., *Dialog Antar Umat Beragama di Indonesia: Gagasan dan Praktik* (Bandung: Mizan and Yogyakarta: Program Studi Agama dan Lintas Budaya Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2010).

42. Cf. Heru Prakosa, "Dynamism of Christian Muslim Relation in Indonesia," in *Asian Journey – Interreligious Dialogue Meeting,* proceeding of the meeting in Kuta, Bali (28 September–1 October 2015), 76.

43. Global caliphate, Islamic state, and the application of *sharia* are the goals of radical organizations in Indonesia today. Experts have warned that radical ideologies are spreading

Indonesia recently show that the swing of the pendulum is moving from the moderate middle to a more extreme right. At least, there are three general factors driving it.

First, there is an interconnectivity between external influence from the Middle East which has brought the ideas of Pan-Islamism, Muslim Brotherhood, and global caliphate to Muslims in Indonesia,[44] like *Jamaah Islamiyah* (JI), *Jamaah Ansarut Tauhid* (JAT), *Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia* (MMI). Ma'arif even mentioned that Wahhabism plays a significant role and in fact becomes a role model in creating and converting Muslims in Indonesia into terrorists.[45]

Second, the structuralist-oriented approach argues that the extremist movement is rooted in the poverty problem in society. "The emergence of Islamist organizations is initially preceded by economic inequality and political marginalization."[46] Militant Islam tends to surge in countries experiencing disillusionment, poverty and despair.[47] No wonder that radical groups usually recruit many young people from desperate and poor families.[48]

Third, it is more a political factor than a religious one. Some movements from the extremists were used by undiscerning politicians to serve and achieve

---

among the young at traditional boarding schools, known as *pesantren*, which are common in regional cities. Some are also attracted to the Islamic State group and other militant organizations through social media (Wasisto Raharjo Jati, "Radicalism in the Perspective of Islamic-Populism, Trajectory of Political Islam in Indonesia," *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 7, no. 2 [December 2013]: 270–85). Recently, we can see how some hard-liners make use of religious sentiments, compose fake news and throw those fake news into social media.

44. Saiful Mujani, *Muslim Demokrat, Islam, Budaya Demokrasi, dan Partisipasi Politik di Indonesia Pasca-orde Baru* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2007), 45.

45. Abdurrahman Wahid, *Ilusi Negara Islam* (Jakarta: Maarif and Wahid Institute, 2011), 74.

46. Jati, "Radicalism in the Perspective of Islamic-Populism," 284.

47. Rumadi, from Wahid Institute, observed a combination of three factors behind the emergence of religious radicalism in Indonesia: (1) disappointment with the democratic system which is considered secular and where religion has no space in the state, and thus, the struggle for theocratic state is deemed necessary; (2) disappointment with the collapse of the social system caused by the state's powerlessness to manage society's life religiously; and (3) political injustice which breeds religious radicalism as a form of opposition or resistance towards political systems which are regarded as oppressive and unfair (Rumadi, "Democracy and Religious Radicalism," 2002, http://islamlib.com/en/article/democracy-and-religious-radicalism/ [accessed December 15, 2018]).

48. A survey report from Centre of Islamic Studies and Peace during October 2010 to January 2011 showed that 49 percent of students in Jakarta, Bogor, Tangerang, and Bekasi tend to agree to take violent action to resolve the problem of religion and morality (BBC Indonesia, "Survei: hampir 50 persen pelajar setuju tindakan radikal," 26 April 2011, https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/berita_indonesia/2011/04/110426_surveiradikalisme [accessed December 15, 2018]).

their own goal. "Some observers assert that their rise has been sponsored, or at least helped, out of conviction or political factors, or both, by certain Indonesian military leaders."[49] Some undiscerning politicians or some Indonesian military leaders used the religious issues between Muslims and non-Muslims and the political sentiments between radical and mainstream Islam in Indonesia[50] to gain power. The clear evidence for this factor is the case of Ahok. The Ahok's case (blasphemy) is the tip of the iceberg of political Islam in Indonesia and some politicians utilized the situation by fanning the fire of the religious issues to get more votes.[51]

Those factors are exactly what Madigan alerts about intra-civilizational conflicts and in that condition, we have a duty to be accountable to each other and discern together. If we see the complexity of those aforementioned factors, we can say that they (the extremists) do not attack only the Christians, but also the moderate Muslims and the non-partisan government. In this area, what we need is to cooperate with the moderate Muslims and the government, since they (the extremists and some undiscerning politicians) prefer to divide us. In the words of Madigan, it is a time to build our "we." Strengthening the collaboration in the grassroots becomes not only an option but a necessity. We should be accountable to each other. In this collaboration, one aspect that Madigan also recalls is to reflect together on our shared failures. We should examine what is missing in our collaboration so far.

First, if the radical groups have successfully employed social media to spread their message on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube, we can examine first, whether we really give attention to the development of social media in promoting unity in diversity or we just ignore and let them occupy the media with their message. By reflecting on this, we also need to create a campaign on social media or to launch an internet-literacy program to counter their movement. We can take a closer look at how creatively the radical groups use technology to spread their ideology.

---

49. Azyumardi Azra, "Radical and Mainstream Islam: New Dynamics in Indonesia," in *Religion and Religiosity in the Philippines and Indonesia,* ed. Theodore Friend (Washington, D.C.: Southeast Asia Studies Program, Johns Hopkins University, 2006), 23.

50. The battle of the two wings of Islam in Indonesia is indeed a long story. Since in the beginning of the independence, there was a long debate between the nationalist Islam who accepted Pancasila as a national foundation and radical Islam who wanted to establish an Islamic state.

51. Andang L. Binawan, "The Case of a Christian Governor in Jakarta as a Sign of Times for Catholic (and Christians) in Indonesia," *International Journal of Asian Christianity* 1 (2018): 135–42.

Second, if the radical groups can enter into the educational system and indoctrinate the youth with their concepts and ideology, we need to examine as well our care and engagement for the education of the youth and our collaboration in that area. Many can speak about the idea of multiculturalism or pluralism in education, but we never ask ourselves about our failure in it or in collaborative educational efforts. Do we just pour out all the good virtues or do we invite them to practice the virtues into habits?

Third, if the radical groups have called poverty as a main motive of their protest (if it is so), we can examine ourselves first as well about what we have done for justice for the poor and the oppressed. Have we really cared and worked together for the marginalized? Or do not we really care for them? An important point of Madigan is that in every form of dialogue with Muslims, we need to examine first ourselves and acknowledge our shared failures. By doing that, we are on the way to walk together with them (not to compete, which one is better, or to argue something that divides us more).

D.2. Entering the Theological Dialogue with Mutual Hospitality

Occasionally, the tension that attaches to the respective faiths arises and the extremists use this way by tapping the religious sentiments. Since, each religious group remained a foreigner for the other, and they did not know each other rightly,[52] it is still very easy to push the people into conflict with such ambiguous religious sentiments. Consequently, in the discussion, we only continued the old debate without much progress in mutual understanding.[53]

Meanwhile, looking at the recent years of the era of Indonesian reformation, there is remaining a hope to grow more in mutual understanding.

52. From the 16th century on, the relations between Christians and Muslims in Indonesia have been, for the most part, confrontational. Yet, Karel Steenbrink also notes that the relationship was stable, especially during the period between 1900-1945 when the emerging nationalist intellectuals emphasized nationalism over religion. But during the New Order Era (1966–1998), all differences had to be pushed aside, at all cost, for the sake of maintaining "harmony." So all kinds of interfaith fora sponsored by the government were only to repress the conflict. This act was primarily political, instead of a genuine interreligious collaboration and dialogue. Steenbrink, *Pattern of Muslim-Christian Dialogue in Indonesia 1965-1998,* 81–112.

53. Cf. Wahju Satria Wibowo, "Jesus as Kurban – Christology in the Context of Islam in Indonesia," doctoral dissertation in Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam, 2014), 75–78, and Bambang Subandrijo, "Eikon and Ayat: Points of Encounter Between Indonesian Christian and Muslim Perspective on Jesus," doctoral Dissertation at Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam, 2007), 76–90.

There are some Indonesian Muslim scholars wrote about Jesus by "listening" to Christian theology and then comprehended it from the Muslim perspective.[54] Some Indonesian Christian theologians also publish writings in regard to Christology in the context of Islam.[55] *Dialog Antar Umat Beragama di Indonesia: Gagasan dan Praktik* (2010) also recorded some activities from some NGOs about theological dialogue from below.[56] It is a good chance to develop the theological dialogue. What is needed is openness. "To be more open to other faiths and at the same time to make Jesus Christ and his message known in a way that is acceptable, presenting him to others using their terms and symbols."[57]

In this area, according to the thought of Daniel Madigan, all Christians are challenged to exercise mutual theological hospitality. Hospitality (Ind: *keramahtamahan*) is not foreign for Indonesians. For instance, in Javanese culture, this term is used for the nobility of the human relationship with the neighbor.[58] One should behave well before the others: respectful, considerate and virtuous in the proper time as well as place, so that the others feel comfortable to speak or listen. The image that Madigan coins about "be a good host and be a good guest" exactly points out this manner.

54. For example: Hasyim Muhammad, *Kristologi Qur'ān* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2005); Syafaatun Almirzanah, *When Mystic Masters Meet: Paradigma Baru dalam Relasi Umat Kristiani-Muslim* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2009); Zuhairi Misrawi, *Al Qur'ān Kitab Toleransi: Tafsir Tematik Islam Rahmatin Lil'alamin* (Jakarta: Pustaka Oasis, 2010); Waryono AG, *Kristologi Islam: Telaah Kritis Kitab Rad Al-Jamil Karya Al-Ghazali* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2012).

55. For example: Stanley Rambitan, "Jesus in Islamic Context of Indonesia," *Journal of Reformed Ecumenical Council* 3, no. 2 (June 2003); J. B. Banawiratma, "Contextual Christology and Christians Praxis: An Indonesian Reflection," *East Asia Pastoral Review* 37 (2000); Andreas Yewangoe, *Theologia Crucis in Asia, Asian Christian Views on Suffering in the Face of Overwhelming Poverty and Multifaceted Religiosity in Asia* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987); Hartono Budi, "Yesus," in *Meniti Kalam Kerukunan,* ed. Nur Kholis Setyawan and Djaka Soetapa (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2010), 425–53.

56. *Dialog Antar Umat Beragama di Indonesia* (2010) recorded some activities from some Non-Govermental Organizations (NGOs) about dialogue on theological and faith issues from below (Inter-fidei, Percik, ICRP, eLaIeM, Wahid Institute). J. B. Banawiratma, Zainal Abidin Bagir, eds., *Dialog Antar Umat Beragama di Indonesia: Gagasan dan Praktik* (Cilandak: PT Mizan Publika, 2010), 50–58, 131–230.

57. Cf. AMSAL (Asian-born Missionary Societies of Apostolic Life) I (Tagaytay): 2; ACMC (Asian Colloquium on Ministries in the Church) (Hong Kong): 14.

58. Cf. Suwardi, "Ethic Values Towards on Memayu Hayuning Bawana in the Mystic Literature of Javanese Spiritual Belief," Paper for International Conference, Ikatan Dosen Budaya Daerah Indonensia at Auditorium of UNY (29 Mei 2010) and Niels Mulder, *Mysticism in Java – Ideology in Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2005), 65–68.

Therefore, what Madigan writes about the Word as a hermeneutical key as a part of mutual theological hospitality can be developed in Indonesia as well. Not only because some Muslims now also develop their theology in relation to plurality, but also because this approach resonates with our local culture. Banawiratma has developed a theological hospitality, but he did not point out yet the particularity of our faith (*kenosis*).[59] Furthermore, theological dialogue with Muslims in Indonesia has pressing relevance today since it can enhance further mutual understanding between Muslims and Christians and makes us more resistant to the radical groups which sow seeds of confusion by undermining our common understanding or employing negative religious sentiments.

The next challenge in Indonesia is to resonate with the Word in the world. It means to embody the Word in the reality of Indonesia: to be witness of the Word in daily life, to work together in our common social and political concern, to promote justice for the poor and marginalized, to discern together an education for justice and peace, as well as the development of an internet-literacy program. What the Indonesian Christians need is to work together through small movements with the moderate Muslims and the government.

E. Conclusion

By the three interrelated dimensions of Interreligious Dialogue, we can understand more fully that the approach of Daniel Madigan is holistic. Madigan emphasizes the essentials of theological dialogue with Muslims. Nevertheless, what he explains about theological dialogue has to do with the deeper foundation in relationship (taking into account our shared failures to respond to love and discerns afterward). By doing that, the theological dialogue can be done and be fruitful. The fruit is not only the understanding the other's concerns, but also the deepening of our own faith.

Through some examinations of Madigan's thought, the author of this article wants to highlight some contributions for the Indonesian context and its challenges today. Two important contributions that can be underlined are the relevance of the dialogue of repentance at the beginning of any kind of dialogue, and the significant approach of mutual hospitality in theological dialogue with

59. See. Banawiratma, "Contextual Christology and Christian Praxis," 173–83; J. B. Banawiratma, "Kristologi dalam Pluralisme Religius," *Orientasi Baru* 13 (2002): 75–86.

Muslims. This approach can be extended into joint-action in education, common social and political concern, and development of technology and communication. It is essential to embrace the moderate Muslims and the government to discern and work together. Christians can't do alone. This is the *kenosis* we have to go through to resonate with the Word.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

B. CHRISTIAN TRIYUDO PRASTOWO is an Indonesian Jesuit. He has a baccalaureate in Sacred Theology and Master of Arts in Theological Studies with field of specialization in Systematic Theology from Loyola School of Theology (LST) Manila. In 2019, he defended his thesis entitled, "Three Interrelated Dimensions of Interreligious Dialogue in Madigan's 'Lenten Journey.'" Now he works at The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary Cathedral, Jakarta, as associate parish priest.